# Monday Version

A] INTERPRETATION: BOTH DEBATERS MUST ASSUME, THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE DEBATE, THAT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IS MORALLY IMPERMISSIBLE. NEITHER DEBATER CAN ACCESS THE BALLOT THROUGH THE POSSIBILITY THAT THERE ARE NO MORAL FACTS OR PROHIBITIONS.

Alternative interpretation: Both burden structures must be such that that any increase in domestic violence is morally significant. You can’t argue that domestic violence might not impact to your standard, nor can you argue that you win if there are no moral prohibitions.

B] VIOLATION:

[NO MORAL OBLIGATIONS/PROHIBITIONS] – This argument [X] implies that there are no moral obligations or prohibitions, which means domestic violence isn’t immoral.

[TRIGGERS] – Their case includes conditions that, if activated, imply that there are no moral obligations or prohibitions. This would imply that domestic violence is not immoral, so it violates my rule. Even if they haven’t ARGUED that there are no obligations, that’s not enough to meet – the possibility of skep is enough.

[DEFINITION] – Their burden structure is such that they can win if everything is permissible. Under my rule, no one could win in that condition because it’s ruled out – we always have to assume that at least some things, like domestic violence, are morally impermissible.

C] Net benefits:

**1] Surprisingly, a lot of Americans condone domestic violence. this gives us a unique responsibility to challenge the norm through debate. Challenging attitudes about domestic violence is necessary to galvanize Americans and enact real change. Klein:**
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Ethel Klein, [Former Professor at Harvard University], Jacquelyn Campbell, Esta Soler, Marissa Ghez, *Ending Domestic Violence: Changing Public Perceptions/Halting the Epidemic*, SAGE Publications Inc., 1997. RK

However, **the vast majority of Americans hold covert attitudes that condone battering and help create an environment in which inaction is the norm rather than the exception.** As reported earlier, the November 1995 Lieberman poll also found that almost half of the American public [46%] currently believes that men sometimes physically abuse women because they are stressed out or drunk, not because they intend to hurt them. This widely held excuse for battering helps explain how **friends, family, and institutions can continue to resist holding [abusers]** men **accountable for their behavior**. The following anecdote is instructive: Ed is a liberal individual who is very progressive on social issues. He mentioned to a woman friend [a domestic violence activist] that he had just made a startling discover- a man with hom he plays weekly basketball regularly beats up his wife. Ed’s woman friend asked him why he continues to play basketball with that kind of person. “Because,” Ed replied, “he’s basically a nice guy.” Highly publicized cases from around the country indicate that as far as the courts are concerned, judges still have much to learn about domestic violence. IN the state of Maryland, for example, a judge recently imposed a sentence of only 18 monhts on a man who shot his wife in the head with a rifle after finding her with another man. The judge stated, “I seriously wonder how many men…would have the strength to walk away without inflicting some corporal punishment. I’m forced to impose a sentence- only because I think I must do it to make the system honest.” Even though the staggering numbers of abused women indicate that progress is slow, we know that **[however] what is learned can be unlearned. Broad cultural messages about** male-female **relationships can be changed; attitudes about what is acceptable behavior can be reframed; children growing up with domestic violence can be taught new behaviors.** Domestic violence can be positioned not only as an issue that touches the lives of more than just abused women and batterers but also as a problem that tears families and communities apart and fills our courtrooms, hospitals, and morgues. **In order to galvanize Americans to take action** on this important problem, **we must identify domestic violence as an issue that individuals** and communities alike can- and **must- address**. We must educate people to recognize that they have a role in helping battered women and their children, teach them that their behavior matters, and show them how to get involved. **The strategic use of communications can play a key role in raising public awareness, changing attitudes, and promoting personal and community involvement.** To be effective, **communications strategies must be aimed at countering the existing cultural acceptance of violence and instead, producing public outrage about and a commitment to stop violence against [victims]** women**.** People can learn. They can change the way they think *and* behave. Witness the success of prevention programs aimed at raising awareness about recycling cigarette smoking, and drunk driving.

**2] By definition, skep and permissibility triggers violate advocacy skills because, if there are no moral obligations/prohibitions, then no option is better than any other. These arguments are copouts so you don’t have to defend a CHOICE.**

3] If we assume DV bad, debate becomes how to address it. That’s the most important education we can gain in the context of the topic. This discussion is uniquely important because the majority of Americans are willing to get involved, but aren’t doing anything because they don’t know how. Klein 2:
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These results also confirm that although respondents to the 1992 EDK poll said they would be willing to do a number of things to address domestic violence- including donating money to a shelter and helping a woman facing abuse- these results were more indicative of the emerging social unacceptability of ignoring the problem [see Chapter 3]. The Lieberman Research results indicate that as far **as concrete action, Americans hadn’t actually done much about domestic violence until relatively recently**. The good news, however, is that things seem to be changing, albeit slowly. And what’s more, we now have a better sense of why Americans *don’t* get involved- reasons that can be addressed in future public education efforts on this subject. **With the public ready to take action against domestic violence, advocates** and policymakers in the field **must provide the public with some direction for action** [after all, **despite an increase in the number of people getting involved**, fully **76% of respondents** to the November 1995 Lieberman poll **had *not* done anything about domestic violence** in the previous year]. **Experts have paid little attention to the question of how to involve and engage the general citizenry in addressing the problem.** Over the next decade, **advocates must identify and promote** simple, safe, and **effective action steps that address three distinct levels: person-to-person contact, individual action, and community action.**

**4] Skepticism and permissibility kill our incentive to talk about the topic. They’ll say we can do both but there’s a strategic incentive to focus on skepticism because [a] you can’t turn it, [b] precludes practical questions and operates at a higher level, [c] people can just get good at practicing these arguments and recycle them from topic to topic.**

D] Terminal Impacts:

Voting issue -- Advocacy skills is the only unique impact to debate

A] Only my model of debate encourages a unique skillset. It teaches debaters how to make the best kind of decisions and weigh the advantages and disadvantages of taking an action.

B] Promotes a portable skill that debaters will value once they leave the activity. Optimal decision-making is crucial to becoming a good lawyer, interviewing for jobs, or even persuading people in general by knowing what are the merits and disadvantages of a particular action. This is offense b/c their model encourages bad skills outside of the activity.

Also drop debater

**1] Precedent - Voting for me sets a precedent in favor of a positive model of debate that people will then emulate because they don’t want to lose rounds. Wins and losses determine the direction of the activity- this is especially true since this is the TOC and the stakes are so high.**

**2] Role of the ballot- the ballot functions as a mechanism to indicate the best advocacy you endorse in the round, i.e. if the aff read a good plan you would endorse that regardless of whether it caused an out-of-round impact. I am winning a superior model of debate. The negative precludes that. You endorse the best model with your ballot so you should vote for me.**

3] Role of the judge – you as an educational critic have an obligation to endorse norms that make debate better as an activity

And, competing interps comes first. Reasonability is bad a] invites judge intervention b] collapses into competing interpretations b/c you debate over a reasonable bright-line c] infinitely regressive --- b/c debaters will keep doing more abusive things and extend the bright line to be reasonable.

# Frontlines

A2 I Need Philosophy Ground

* You can still run deontology as your standard, but you shouldn’t assume your standard is the only thing that matters. It’s just an idiosyncracy of LD that people assume that the value criterion encapsulates everything that matters. So rightful honor matters, but so does increasing or decreasing violence.

Philosophical education

* Non-unique- if you want philosophy education than you should go read a book. Debate is unique because the adversarial format forces us to defend the best policy option- we can’t possibly resolve the 2000 year old question of what the best ethical framework is in 45 minutes- your model of debate leads to shallow debates where debaters come up with bad analytics to handle ethical theories they don’t fully understand. Everyone knows that framework debates in LD are usually blippy and hard to resolve.
* You have four years or more study philosophy and debate it with people who are actually qualified to talk about it in college, but you only have high school debate to become an effective leader for change, to enact social movements, and to become a good citizen.
* My argument functions as an impact turn to your argument- proves that you endorse a bad model of learning about philosophy when you say we no longer care about pressing real-world issues.